In Attendance
Moss
Goulatia
Loftness
Parsakian
Quintanilla
Young
Hornstein (DPW)
Lucas (DOMI)

Staff Present
Dash (Items 4-6)
Minnaert
Cavalline

Agenda Items Covered in These Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. South Side Park Trail</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small Cell Pole Replacement</td>
<td>2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Green Boulevard Phase 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof &amp; Greenhouse</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pirates Lower Riverwalk Monuments</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Art in Parks: Sans façon &amp; Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Saw Mill Run Salt Storage Facility</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Approval of Minutes

Moss asks Commissioners to review and comment on minutes from December 2021. Loftness motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Parsakian. All ayes, Goulatia recusing. Motion carries.

B. Items for Review

1. Side South Park Trail – South Side Community Council Conceptual/Final Review

Joe Hackett of LaQuatra Bonci gives the presentation for a new ADA trail in South Side Park.

Moss notes that this is not a City-funded project and so does not require a Percent For Art. Hackett confirms this.
Loftness asks for a description of the vistas and the landscape material adjacent to the walks. Hackett describes the entry to the park, the landscape around the trails, and a visitor’s viewing experience onsite. Loftness asks if a visitor would leave the trail and walk through the meadow. Hackett says that the plant material of the meadow will be higher than the trail so they hope that will deter visitors from walking through it. He also says they hope to later connect other trails of the park to this trail. Loftness asks if there is seating in the plan. Hackett says there is a small amount of seating adjacent to the parking lot.

Hornstein thanks Hackett for his work. He says he is concerned that pet owners may take their dogs off leash here. Hackett says the meadow plants will be kept fairly high so it is unlikely to be a place for dogs to run. Hornstein asks how big the meadow is. Hackett says about 15,000 square feet.

Quintailla says it is more of a loop than a trail, and confirms that it may connect to other trails in the future. Hackett says yes. Quintanilla says it could be dangerous and asks if it will be lit. Hackett says no, but the community garden is adjacent and there are always people coming in and out. Quintanilla says with the taller plants it could be very secluded. Hackett says it is their hope that the space will be activated so that there will usually be numerous people onsite. Quintanilla asks if there is an opening in the fence allowing access from the garden. Hackett says no.

Hornstein asks that some simple signage be recommended that says dogs must be kept on leash, which the City could provide. He says that DPW would like to specify location of this signage.

Goulatia urges that they consider adding art. Loftness suggests a connection to the community garden and potentially a plan to add benches. Hackett says the South Side Community Council hopes to raise funds for more improvements in the future.

Lucas says that the City has draft Trail Standards for design elements, which they’d be happy to have further discussion about.

Moss summarizes that the Commission asks that signage be coordinated with DPW and that they have recommended the integration of art, connection to the community garden, and opportunities for seating.

**MOTION: Conceptual/Final Approval**

MOVED BY: Parsakian
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

2. **Small Cell Pole Replacement – Extenet Systems**

   **Conceptual/Final Review**

   Timothy Asta and Matt Sturgill of Extenet Systems present this project for the removal of an existing City of Pittsburgh streetlight and its replacement with a new pole to accommodate 4G and 5G antennas for multiple carriers.

   Quintanilla asks if they can see what the existing poles look like. Asta describes the current poles and explains the difference between these and the proposed pole, and references the photos submitted in the application materials.

   Loftness brings up the City’s dark sky ordinance. Asta says they are attempting to comply with any dark sky mandates.

   Goulatia asks if the lights will be higher than other lights on the street. Asta says the lights on this pole will be slightly lower, at 15’ versus the current 18’. Goulatia says it should be at the same height as the existing poles. Goulatia asks if they can put structures on the roof of buildings instead of occupying the sidewalks. Asta says that if they mount the new luminaires at the same height as the current ones, they will have to increase the overall height as well. He says that the poles near the intersection are taller,
but the midblock ones are closer to the proposed height. He also says that buildings have a shielding effect from the signal being delivered to the end user at street level.

Loftness says the paddle at the top overwhelms the light fixtures, and asks how this lighting would change the distribution of light on the sidewalk. Moss asks why they can’t reuse the existing luminaire, and why they are proposing two lights instead of one as currently exists. Asta says they have worked with City staff and there is flexibility in luminaire design but it may appear anomalous as it would be on a single side arm.

Sturgill references the City’s small cell guidelines and says they were trying to match the approved two-luminaire design as much as possible. Lucas says that the two aspects of this application that did not conform to existing standards have to do with not matching the adjacent pole styles, and the height. She says the standard is for poles to not exceed 15% additional height when compared to the poles near it.

Goulatia says this pole looks very different from what exists and will stand out. She confirms that it is a replacement pole, and Asta says yes. Goulatia says it will change the aesthetics of the place. Quintanilla says that there could end up being three different pole styles near this intersection, which will look very busy. He says that the base diameter is significantly different. He says that he understands the need for the technology, but is uncomfortable with how different this pole is from the other poles in the vicinity.

Moss agrees with Goulatia and says they need to think of the pole in relation to the other poles on this block, particularly with the height of the luminaires and the banners. He says that the City may be moving toward different standards in the future, but for the sake of this review it is more important to maintain the character of this particular street. Moss says that even if the fixture were not able to be on top of the pole, this may be preferable if they were able to maintain the same fixture and the same height.

Goulatia asks if this equipment can be incorporated into one of the nearby taller poles.

Asta says they could attempt another design, but the proposed location is where they need to be from the perspective of the carriers. He says they were following the approved design for a two-luminaire as much as possible, and if it is more appropriate to have a single luminaire then they can redesign in that way.

Goulatia asks if the antenna has to be on top or if it can be below the luminaire. Asta says usually the antenna needs to be as high as possible for the network to function well. Loftness asks if there is a wireless node in the base as well, or only in the paddle at the top. Sturgill says the 4G technology needs to fit inside the base and so it needs to be at least 20", and at the top there are antennas and technology for 4G and 5G. He says they have done everything they can to make this pole as small as possible.

Loftness says she’s not sure that the light pole is the best place for this equipment, and suggests nearby entrance canopies or rooftops. Sturgill says that from a location perspective, the carriers need to be at this intersection. He says that the antennas need to be below the roof line to minimize interference with other small cells. He also says there are traffic control signals at the intersection that they are not allowed to install on. Loftness asks if this could be negotiated with the City as it seems a more acceptable location. Sturgill says they would like to but the City will not consider this. Lucas says last week the City published new small cell guidelines that have opportunities to leverage equipment in those areas, so that the City is in compliance with new State requirements.

Sturgill says that in the small cell guidelines there is a design similar to what they are trying to replicate but it is only in 5G technology, and this pole is for both 4G and 5G, which is why it needs to be bigger.

Quintanilla asks if the pole will be black. Sturgill says the City standard is black, but they would use grey here because the other nearby poles are grey.

Goulatia says she also has a problem with the parking sign on the pole as it looks cluttered.

**MOTION: Table**
3. **Green Boulevard Phase 1 – Department of Mobility and Infrastructure**

   Conceptual/Final Review

Mike Panzitta of DOMI introduces the project, which is the first phase of implementation of the Allegheny River Green Boulevard. Nina Chase of Merritt Chase gives the presentation for the project, which includes a shared-use pedestrian and bicycle path including site furniture and plantings.

Loftness says it’s a great addition to Lawrenceville. She asks about the landscape materials. Chase says there is currently gravel from the railroad but the intention is to get as much planting as possible. She says that underneath and between the trees will be perennial planting. Loftness asks if the asphalt could be porous instead of impervious. Chase says they did not look at impervious, as pervious is the City standard. Panzitta says they discussed it, but due to the narrowness of the site it did not seem maintainable. Loftness says it would make sense for the asphalt to be lighter.

Loftness says she isn’t a fan of bollards and asks what the intention of them is. Chase says the standard in the City is for trails to have bollards so that cars cannot drive onto the trail.

Parsakian asks what the width of the trail is. Chase says it varies from 8-10 feet wide. Panzitta says the walls were included to maximize the space without having to go onto the railroad property. Parsakian asks how tall the fence is. Chase says it is 4 feet, but the Durahold wall adds some height.

Parsakian notes that the project is proposing holding off on the Percent For Art project until a later time, and says that the entrances to the trail would be great opportunities for art. Minnaert says that PACD has had several conversations with the project team, and that this phase has a relatively small budget. They would like to wait until a later phase to engage artists in order to have more available funds. Panzitta says that they would like to have a project that would be consistent throughout the trail.

Goulatia agrees that the bollards are ugly and says they cause accidents instead of prevent them. She asks if there is an alternative. Panzitta says the proposed yellow bollards are the standard, but they can talk about this with the design team.

Quintanilla compliments it overall, but says the bollards should be reconsidered. Loftness suggest using bike racks.

**MOTION: Conceptual and Final Approval of Green Boulevard Phase 1, with the condition that the bollard design is revisited and receives further Art Commission approval.**

MOVED BY: Quintanilla
SECONDED BY: Goulatia
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

4. **The Porch at Schenley Patio Roof & Greenhouse – Axis Architecture**

   Conceptual/Final Review

Craig Collins of Axis Architecture and Jesse Stock of Eat N Park Hospitality Group give the proposal for a new roof and shade system over the existing patio of The Porch at Schenley, and a small adjacent greenhouse to be used by the restaurant.

Loftness says she is worried about where water will go. She also questions the rolling shades, as it will be a small amount of time that the sun hits that part of the building. Moss asks if the greenhouse will
be used year-round. Collins says probably for nine months of the year. Loftness notes that it is not an enclosed structure. Collins say that it is not insulated or weather-proof. He also says that the roof will slope to drains that will be brought down the building and tied into the building’s stormwater system. Loftness asks if that is in the drawings. Collins says no.

Loftness asks if the greenhouse is freestanding. Collins says yes, there would be about five feet between the greenhouse and the restaurant. She asks if one of the two knee walls will be taken out. Collins says that is an errant line in the plan and there is only one knee wall. Moss asks if the knee wall will remain, and asks what the dimensions of the greenhouse are. Collins says the dimensions are 8’ wide by 24’ long, and the knee wall would remain. Moss asks if the greenhouse has plumbing or heat. Collins says no.

Loftness says that this seems fine for Conceptual Review but not for Final Review. Moss notes that they would typically like to see material samples. He asks if there are specifications for the rolling shade material. Collins says not at this point. Moss asks if the rolling shade will be in a track, and Collins says yes and that it will come down between the columns.

Quintanilla clarifies where the entrance to the greenhouse is. He asks if the greenhouse can interact more with the adjacent amphitheater instead of being aligned with the sidewalk. Collins says they can investigate other locations, and that they had tried to make it more of a background feature. Quintanilla says that the greenhouse may be able to be a feature that adds liveliness to that space. He notes that the proposed front has a more industrial look as compared to the existing wood details. Collins says that the intent is to have it blend in instead of making much of a statement.

Parsakian asks if they have considered integrating the greenhouse into the design of the building, instead of having it be separate. Collins says that they have not up to this point, but they could take that into consideration. Parsakian says it doesn’t look like it belongs there and they could rethink how the greenhouse interacts with the environment around it. Parsakian asks if the restaurant door that leads to the greenhouse is also a fire exit for the kitchen staff. Collins says it is a required egress from the restaurant. Parsakian asks if there’s another way to make it connected, or if that is impossible. Collins says he does not know offhand. Stock says that the greenhouse was separated from the main building to get as much sun exposure as it could, and it was situated near the sidewalk because they wanted to highlight that fresh produce was being grown and used in the restaurant. Parsakian says he likes the mission, but questions the basic design of the greenhouse.

Moss says that if the mission of the greenhouse is being highlighted it makes sense to place it near the sidewalk, but in this case the design becomes more important. If the design is low cost and of rudimentary design, then it is probably better as less of a public element.

Loftness says that it looks like the greenhouse may be difficult to construct without taking out one or two existing trees. Loftness says she understands the need for a roof, but says they need to be sure they can insert it without removing a tree.

Goulatia says in India they have trees within spaces to bring the outdoors inside, and this may be something they can look at.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness
SECONDED BY: Young
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

5. **Pirates Lower Riverwalk Monuments – Pittsburgh Pirates**

Janet Marie Smith, design consultant to the Pittsburgh Pirates, presents this project which consists of two monument displays honoring Pittsburgh baseball players. The first is made up of representations of
player numbers that have been retired. The second is a series of baseball honoring Pittsburgh players
who have been inducted into the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

Goulatia says she loves the attention to detail in the project. She asks how much space on the
sidewalk the objects take up. Smith says they sit in the green space and do not intrude onto the public
sidewalk. Goulatia asks if they have considered placing them more organically instead of in a row.

Loftness asks if they anticipate people sitting on the baseballs. Smith says it is possible, as they are
crude and it would not be damaging. Loftness says the project is whimsical and brings the activity of
PNC Park down to the riverfront. She asks if the baseballs can be given a sense of stitched leather. Smith
says the stitching will be raised so it will have that texture.

Quintanilla says that people should be able to interact with the numbers instead of walking through
the landscaping. Smith says they will sit next to the ramp and so people could take pictures right beside
them. Quintanilla says it could be worth it to create a base around the numbers so people can better
interact with them.

Parsakian asks if there will be interactive plaques that would include braille or a QR code. Smith says
the information on the retired numbers will be presented in English and Spanish, in some version for the
vision impaired, and with a QR code for more information. Young asks what the size of the plaque on the
numbers is. She says there is an opportunity to make it more visible. Smith says it is a placeholder and
they will consider that when they size it. Goulatia asks if they have thought of putting the signage on the
floor. Young says it is not disruptive placed on the side of the numbers.

Parsakian asks if there is a way to connect this to the Heinz History Center and the Roberto
Clemente Museum. Smith says they have consulted with both of those organizations.

Quintanilla asks if the elements will be lit. Smith says the walkways are well lit and they are not
proposing to add any illumination. Quintanilla says he can imagine the numbers popping if they were
illuminated. Smith says they will consider that.

6. **Art in Parks: Sans façon & Steve Gurysh in Riverview Park – Public Art & Civic Design
Division Conceptual Review**

Tristan Surtees and Charles Blanc of Sans façon are joined by artist Steve Gurysh in presenting the
initial development of a public art project in Riverview Park through the City’s Art in Parks program.

Moss says he appreciates their thoughtful approach and says he thinks that this project should
possibly be tabled and return for Conceptual Review when the ideas have been developed further.
Loftness agrees. She says their previous work is fantastic but it is unclear what they would be proposing
for this park. Moss says they have done a great job in researching the park and he is anxious to see what
they come up with. Parsakian says he also appreciates their research, and compliments their earlier work.
Young compliments their focus on community storytelling. Goulatia says she wishes the artists had more
time to present, as she wants to hear more.

**MOTION: Table**

MOVED BY: Moss
SECONDED BY: Loftness
IN FAVOR: All
OPPOSED: None

7. **Saw Mill Run Salt Storage Facility – Department of Public Works
Conceptual/Final Review**

Felipe Palomo of DPW, Dana Klann of Civil & Environmental Consultants, and Ed Karl of
Architectural Innovations present plans for the demolition of the existing salt storage facility and adjacent
building and construction of new Salt Storage Building, along with landscaping and stormwater management features. The project includes revisions made since being reviewed at the November 2021 Art Commission.

Moss thanks the applicants for revisiting the design and says it is clearly an improvement. He notes that there is a strong base with a lighter top half and asks why this scheme is not continued along the east façade. Karl says that is a challenging wall to frame due to the need to reinforce around the doorways. Moss agrees they may need more stability on that side.

Loftness says the design is much stronger. She asks if plants could be introduced around the east façade. She asks about the comfort station and whether something could be done to give workers inside more of a view. Karl says that minimal time will be spent in the comfort station, but they can consider this.

Goulatia asks if the bottom area is made of concrete. Karl says yes. Goulatia asks if there can be any more lightness added to the front (east) side. She says she does not understand the purpose of siding that imitates wood, and this ends up looking cheap.

Parsakian asks how translucent the fiberglass will be. Karl says that the FRP panels are translucent but not transparent. He says the polycarbonate is a clear plastic, but these panels cannot span as far. Parsakian asks which will be used. Karl says it will be transparent, but has a corrugated texture to it. Goulatia asks if the salt will affect the polycarbonate panels. Karl says that the lifespan of the polycarbonate will not be equal to the metal from their original design, and there will likely be some dust from the salt.

Loftness asks about the facia material. Karl says it is fiber cement composite panels. She says she loves the warmth and that it compliments the wood structure. She says it is important that it doesn’t look like fake wood and it would’ve been good to see a sample.

Parsakian asks where they will see the Percent For Art. Palomo says that they have been exploring possibilities of an art project at the Seldom Seen Greenway entrance. Parsakian says the two blank walls at the entrance would be a good opportunity for public art. Loftness agrees.

Lisa Brown of Watersheds of South Pittsburgh makes public comment in opposition to the project due to environmental concerns regarding the adjacent stream.

Moss says that maintaining the location of the salt storage facility is an important consideration, but he does not think it is in the purview of the Art Commission. He says that the Commission is concerned with making sure that if the facility is built here, it is done so in the best way it can in regard to aesthetics.

Goulatia says she has reservations concerning the wood treatment, which she says would be better as stone; and the polycarbonate, which she says will look dirty.

Moss says that the materiality of the building’s base could be explored further. Goulatia says she is also concerned with how large the structure is. Loftness says she doesn’t think the applicants had much of a choice in the size, as they need the space to store the salt. She says that the size may actually reduce the amount of salt that ends up outside of the building. She agrees that it is not the Commission’s purview to judge whether the facility should exist here, and says the applicants have done a good job being sensitive to the salt runoff. Parsakian notes that they addressed the location at their first hearing, and the applicant explained that there were no other viable sites.

Moss summarizes the comments as concerning 1) the design of the east façade, 2) landscaping around that façade, 3) the possibility of greater light/viewshed at the comfort station, 4) the color of the fiber cement siding so that it doesn’t look like imitation wood, 5) further understanding of the specific materials of the polycarbonate and fiber cement, 6) further clarification on the use of the Percent For Art, and 7) what precautions are being made to reduce salt runoff. Moss states that he would consider giving this project Conceptual Approval but not Final.

Goulatia says that she knows the location of the facility is not in their purview, but she has reservations concerning salt runoff into the stream.
Hornstein says he understands that reservation, but it is important to point out that there are a lot of regulatory bodies looking at this project, including the State and the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority. The City will be complying with all guidance from these bodies regarding protecting the stream.

**MOTION: Conceptual Approval**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Parsakian  
IN FAVOR: Moss, Quintanilla, Young  
OPPOSED: Goulatia

C. **Correspondence**

Minnaert notes the correspondence that the Commission received via email regarding the Extenet and Saw Mill Run Salt Storage applications.

D. **Public Comment**

None.

E. **Commission Officer Elections**

**MOTION: Andrew Moss for Art Commission President**

MOVED BY: Goulatia  
SECONDED BY: Quintanilla  
IN FAVOR: Loftness, Parsakian, Young  
OPPOSED: None

**MOTION: Sarika Goulatia for Art Commission Secretary**

MOVED BY: Loftness  
SECONDED BY: Moss  
IN FAVOR: Parsakian, Quintanilla, Young  
OPPOSED: None

F. **Director & Staff Report**

Minnaert notes the Over-The-Counter applications from the last month that were forwarded to the Commission.

Minnaert describes two calls for art currently active through the City, which are for Arsenal Park and the Davis Avenue Bridge.

The Commissioners discuss the amount of time given to applicants to present, and whether some presentations can be given more time than others.

Dash says that Karen Abrams has been appointed as the new Director of City Planning. Dash says that he will be continuing in a newly-created position as Deputy Director of City Planning. He says that he anticipates continuing to work with the Art Commission.
Dash says that there have not been any discussions with the new administration in regards to new Commissioner appointments, and he expects the continuation of current Commissioner appointments.

G. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 P.M.